

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

BRIAN DUSSIA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 21-cv-12279  
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

SRS DISTRIBUTION INC., d/b/a  
MONROE ALUMINUM PRODUCTS,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART  
DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF No. 15)**

On June 29, 2023, the Court held a hearing on Defendant SRS Distribution Inc.’s (“SRS”) Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 15). For the reasons explained on the record during that hearing, SRS’s motion (ECF No. 15) is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**. The motion is **GRANTED** to the extent that SRS seeks summary judgment with respect to Plaintiff’s claims for discrimination and failure to accommodate under the Americans with Disabilities Act (Count I), Plaintiff’s claims for discrimination and failure to accommodate under the Michigan Persons with Disabilities Civil Rights Act (Count III), and Plaintiff’s retaliation claim arising under the Michigan Workers’ Disability Compensation Act (Count IV). The motion is **DENIED** to the extent that SRS seeks summary judgment

with respect to Plaintiff's retaliation claim arising under the American Disabilities Act (Count II).<sup>1</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Matthew F. Leitman

MATTHEW F. LEITMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: June 29, 2023

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on June 29, 2023, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan

Case Manager

(313) 234-5126

---

<sup>1</sup> As Plaintiff's counsel acknowledged on the record, the Count II retaliation claim survives summary judgment based solely on the theory that Plaintiff was retaliated against for requesting accommodations, and not on the theory that Plaintiff was retaliated against for filing a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.